	Case3:12-cv-06423-CRB Document50	Filed02/21/13 Page1 of 20
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	PHILIP RICCIARDI,	CASE NO. 12-CV-06003
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER
13 14	V.	CONSOLIDATING SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE ACTIONS AND SETTING
15	MICHAEL R. LYNCH, et al.	SCHEDULE FOR FILING OF A CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT AND
16	Defendants,	FURTHER PROCEEDINGS
17	-and-	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer Complaint Filed: November 26, 2012
18	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	Complaint Filed. November 20, 2012
19	Nominal Defendant.	
20		
21	[Caption continues on following page.]	
22	[capiton commues on jonowing page.]	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
20	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	Page 1

1		
2	ERNESTO ESPINOZA,	CASE NO. 12-CV-06025
3	Plaintiff, v.	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer Complaint Filed: November 27, 2012
5	MICHAEL R. LYNCH, et al.	
6	Defendants,	
7	-and-	
8	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	
9	Nominal Defendant.	
11	ANDREA BASCHERI, et al,	CASE NO. 12-CV-06091
12	Plaintiffs, v.	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer Complaint Filed: November 30, 2012
13		2011praint 1 110a. 1 (0 (0 1100) 20, 2012
14	LEO APOTHEKER, et al.	
15	Defendants,	
16	-and-	
17	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	
18	Nominal Defendant.	
19	MARTIN BERTISCH,	CASE NO. 12-CV-06123
20 21	Plaintiff,	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
22	V.	Complaint Filed: December 3, 2012
23	LEO APOTHEKER, et al.	
24	Defendants,	
25	-and-	
26	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	
27	Nominal Defendant.	
28 ES	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	Page 2

1	CITY OF BIRMINGHAM RETIREMENT	CASE NO. 12-CV-06416
2	AND RELIEF SYSTEM,	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
3	Plaintiff, v.	Complaint Filed: December 18, 2012
4	L FO A DOWNEY D	
5	LEO APOTHEKER, et al.	
6	Defendants,	
7	-and-	
8	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	
9	Nominal Defendant.	
10		
11	JOSEPH TOLA,	CASE NO. 12-CV-06423
12	Plaintiff,	Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
13	V.	Complaint Filed: December 18, 2012
14	MICHAEL R. LYNCH, et al.	
15	Defendants,	
16	-and-	
17	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	
18	Nominal Defendant.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	Page

1	STANLEY MORRICAL,	CASE NO. 12-C	V-06434
2	Plaintiff,	Judge:	Hon. Charles R. Breyer
3	V.	Complaint Filed:	December 19, 2012
4	MARGARET C. WHITMAN, et al.		
5	Defendants,		
6	-and-		
7	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,		
8	Nominal Defendant.		
9	Nominal Defendant.		
10			
11			
12			
13 14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		Page 4

WHEREAS, the following seven actions are now pending in the Northern District of California (collectively, the "HP Derivative Actions"):

Philip Riccardi v. Michael R. Lynch et al., Case No. 12-cv-06003-CRB

Ernesto Espinoza v. Michael R. Lynch et al., Case No. 12-cv-06025-CRB

Andrea Bascheri et al. v. Leo Apotheker et al., Case No. 12-cv-06091-CRB

Martin Bertisch v. Leo Apotheker et al., Case No. 12-cv-06123-CRB

City of Birmingham Retirement and Relief System v. Leo Apotheker et al., Case No. 12-cv-06416-CRB

Joseph Tola v. Michael R. Lynch et al., Case No. 12-cv-06423-CRB

Stanley Morrical v. Margaret C. Whitman et al., Case No. 12-cv-06434-CRB;

WHEREAS, the seven HP Derivative Actions are styled as shareholder derivative actions on behalf of Nominal Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company ("HP"), and each asserts claims that arise from or relate to HP's acquisition of Autonomy Corporation PLC in 2011;

WHEREAS, the Court determined by order entered January 3, 2013 in the earlier-filed action entitled Nicolow v. Hewlett-Packard Co., Case No. 12-cv-05980-CRB, that each of the seven HP Derivative Actions identified above are related pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(a), and all have been assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer;<sup>1</sup>

WHEREAS, the HP Derivative Actions identified above all arise out of the same transactions and occurrences and involve the same or substantially similar issues of law and facts, and, therefore, should be consolidated for all purposes under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a);

27

The Court's January 3, 2013 Order determined that ten pending actions are related to the earliest-filed case, which is a putative securities class action captioned Nicolow v. Hewlett-Packard Co., Case No. 12-cv-05980-CRB ("Nicolow"). The pending actions related to Nicolow consist of (i) the seven HP Derivative Actions that are the subject of this Stipulation; (ii) a putative securities class action captioned Pokoik v. Hewlett-Packard Co., Case No. 12-cv-06074-CRB ("Pokoik"); (iii) an ERISA action captioned Laffen v. Hewlett-Packard Co., Case No. 12cv-06199-CRB ("Laffen"); and (iv) an ERISA action captioned Lustig v. Whitman, Case No. 12cv-06410-CRB ("Lustig"). The Nicolow, Pokoik, Laffen, and Lustig actions are not styled as shareholder derivative actions on behalf of HP and are not subject to this Stipulation.

••

LAW OFFICES
COTCHETT, PITRE
& McCarthy, LLP

WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiffs in the above referenced actions have met and conferred and have agreed to a schedule for filing a motion for lead plaintiff and lead counsel;

WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiffs, nominal defendant HP, and the undersigned defendants have met and conferred and have agreed to a schedule for filing a consolidated complaint following the appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel;

WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiffs, nominal defendant HP, and the undersigned defendants have met and conferred and have agreed that no answers, motions, or other responses to the complaints ("Responses") need be filed in the HP Derivative Actions by HP or by any other defendant until after the appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel and the filing of a consolidated complaint or designation of an operative complaint, as provided below;

WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiffs, nominal defendant HP, and the undersigned defendants have met and conferred and have agreed to a schedule setting a date for Responses to the consolidated complaint and a briefing schedule for any motions filed in response to the consolidated complaint unless otherwise ordered by the Court pursuant to motion or stipulation;

WHEREAS, counsel for nominal defendant HP has raised with plaintiffs' counsel issues regarding a potential stay pending determination of motions to dismiss in related class actions and staged briefing of motions in this action and will seek to meet and confer with the parties on these subjects regarding a potential stipulation and/or motion schedule following the appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel.

WHEREAS, the agreed-upon schedule is not for the purpose of delay, promotes judicial efficiency, and will not cause prejudice to any party,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED by plaintiffs and all defendants who have appeared in the HP Derivative Action, by and through their undersigned respective counsel of record, as follows:

#### I. CONSOLIDATION OF ACTIONS

1. The seven HP Derivative Actions identified above are hereby consolidated for all purposes, including pretrial proceedings, trial, and appeal.

2. The caption of these consolidated actions shall be "In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation" and the files of these consolidated actions shall be maintained in one master file to be set by the Court. Thereafter, all cases of the original HP Derivative Action case files shall be closed except for the Master Docket C-12-6003CRB.

- 3. Any other actions or claims filed in or removed or transferred to this Court after the date of this Stipulation that (i) are styled as shareholder derivative actions or claims brought on behalf of nominal defendant HP; and (ii) assert claims that arise from or relate to HP's acquisition of Autonomy Corporation PLC in 2011; and (iii) arise out of the same transactions and occurrences and involve the same or substantially similar issues of law and facts as the HP Derivative Actions, shall automatically be consolidated for all purposes, if and when they are brought to the Court's attention, together with *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, and the clerk shall close the file for any such later-filed actions.
- 4. Every pleading filed in the consolidated actions, or in any separate action included herein, shall bear the following caption:

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NO. C-12-6003 CRB

17 |

IN RE HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY MASTER DOCKET

SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE LITIGATION

\_\_\_\_\_

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

5. When a pleading or other filing is int

5. When a pleading or other filing is intended to be applicable to all actions, the words "All Actions" shall appear immediately after or below the words "THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:" in the caption set forth above. When a pleading or other filing is intended to be applicable to less than all actions, the separate caption and docket number for each individual action to which the pleading is intended to be applicable shall appear immediately after or below the words "THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:" in the caption described above.

- 6. When a case or claim that properly belongs as part of *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation* is filed in this Court or transferred or removed to this Court from another court and assigned to Judge Breyer, then following the filing of notice by any party to such action or by a party to *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation* in such other action and this consolidated action, and service of such notice upon all parties that have appeared in the affected actions, the clerk of this Court shall:
  - (a) Place a copy of this Order in the separate file for such action;
- (b) Mail to the attorneys for the plaintiff(s) in the newly filed or transferred case a copy of this Order and direct that this Order be served upon or mailed to any new defendant(s) or their counsel in the newly filed or transferred case;
- (c) Make an appropriate entry on the Master Docket. Counsel recognizes that this Court requests the assistance of counsel in calling to the attention of the clerk of this Court the filing or transfer of any case which properly might be consolidated as part of *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation*; and
  - (d) Close the separate file for such action.
- 7. Counsel for the Defendants signing this Stipulation hereby certify that: (i) service of process has previously been effected or waived with respect to their clients as identified on their signature lines below; or (ii) to the extent their clients have not otherwise been served with process or appeared, counsel for the Defendants signing this Stipulation are authorized to and hereby do waive service of process on behalf of their clients identified below, provided that such waiver of service and the entry into this Stipulation shall not be deemed a waiver of any rights or defenses of any kind, including but not limited to the ability to assert the defense of lack of personal jurisdiction, all of which rights and defenses are expressly reserved.
- 8. Filing of documents via the Court's ECF system shall be deemed to satisfy the service requirement as to all parties who have appeared in the action and whose counsel receive ECF notices electronically. All attorneys of record in *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation* must register for ECF and must file an appearance through the ECF system. Any attorneys who have been admitted *pro hac vice* in any of the HP Derivative

Actions shall also be deemed admitted in *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation* pursuant to the same conditions and requirements. No separate service of documents is required on any party who has appeared in the action but is not registered for ECF.

9. The terms of this Order shall not have the effect of making any person or entity a party to any action in which he, she, or it has not been named and properly served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The terms of this Order and the consolidation and coordination ordered herein shall not constitute a waiver by any party of any claims in or defenses to any of the actions.

#### II. SCHEDULE

### A. Motions for Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel

10. The following dates shall be in effect for motions for lead plaintiff/counsel in the consolidated action:

January 25, 2013: Last Day to File Motions For Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel

<u>February 8, 2013:</u> Last Day to File Oppositions to Motions For Lead

Plaintiff and Lead Counsel

<u>February 15, 2013:</u> Last Day to File Replies To Any Opposition to Motions

For Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel

March 1, 2013: Hearing on Motions for Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel

## B. <u>Existing Complaints</u>

Actions, including HP (collectively, "Defendants"), shall not be required to answer, file motions, or otherwise take any action in response to any of the complaints currently on file in any of the HP Derivative Actions. The time for such Defendants' answers, motions, or other responses shall be determined as specified in Paragraph 14 below, following the filing of a consolidated complaint or designation of an operative complaint, or as the Court hereafter may order. In the event additional actions are subsequently consolidated into *In re Hewlett-Packard Company Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, the parties named as defendants in the complaints in such additional actions shall not be required to answer, file motions, or otherwise take any action in

response to such complaints until the time specified in Paragraph 14 or as otherwise specified by

the Court. No Defendant shall be deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of this Court or to

have waived or otherwise relinquished any rights, arguments, or defenses of any kind by not

filing an answer, motion or other response to any complaint in the consolidated action prior to

the date specified in Paragraph 14 below or other order of the Court. Pursuant to Local Rule 6-

1(a), this paragraph of this Stipulation shall be effective upon its filing with the Court.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

# C. Filing of a Consolidated Complaint

- 12. Lead plaintiff shall, within sixty (60) days following the entry and filing of the Court's order selecting a lead plaintiff and lead counsel, serve and file a consolidated amended complaint or designate a previously-filed complaint as the operative complaint (the "Consolidated Complaint"), which will supersede all existing complaints filed in the HP Derivative Actions and any other action that may be consolidated herewith. To the extent any defendant now named in any of the HP Derivative Actions is not named in the Consolidated Complaint, the claims against such defendant shall be deemed dismissed without prejudice. Service shall be effected with respect to any named defendant by serving the Consolidated Complaint on that defendant's counsel, unless such defendant has not previously been served or appeared, in which case service shall be affected according to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 13. After the appointment of lead plaintiff and lead counsel, the parties shall submit to the Court any stipulations that may be reached relating to HP's suggestions of a stay and/or the staging of responses to the Consolidated Complaint within ten (10) days after the filing of the Consolidated Complaint. If the parties do not otherwise stipulate and any party seeks to alter or modify the schedule for Responses established in Paragraph 14, such party shall file an appropriate motion with the Court seeking such relief.
- 14. Unless the Court otherwise orders pursuant to stipulation, motion, or for any other reason, Defendants shall file their Responses to the Consolidated Complaint within sixty (60) days following the filing of the Consolidated Complaint (provided, however, that the time prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall control to the extent those Rules provide

### Case3:12-cv-06423-CRB Document50 Filed02/21/13 Page11 of 20

1 for a later response date as to any Defendant who has not been served, waived service, or appeared in the action at the time of this Stipulation). In the event that Defendants file any motions directed at the Consolidated Complaint, the opposition brief shall be filed within sixty 3 (60) days of the motions and the reply briefs shall be filed within thirty (30) days thereafter. 4 5 This stipulation is without prejudice to any party's right to move to continue any response(s) to the Consolidated Complaint pursuant to the federal and local rules. 6 7 8 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 9 10 COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP DATED: February 14, 2013 11 /s/ Matthew K. Edling By: 12 MATTHEW K. EDLING 13 JOSEPH W. COTCHETT (Cal. SBN 36324) 14 MARK C. MOLUMPHY (Cal. SBN 168009) 15 NANCI E. NISHIMURA (Cal. SBN 152621) ARON K. LIANG (Cal. SBN 228936) 16 MATTHEW K. EDLING (Cal. SBN: 250940) San Francisco Airport Office Center 17 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200 18 Burlingame, CA 94010 Tel: (650) 697-6000 19 (650) 697-0577 Fax: 20 jcotchett@cpmlegal.com mmolumphy@cpmlegal.com 21 nnishimura@cpmlegal.com 22 aliang@cpmlegal.com medling@cpmlegal.com 23 24 Attorneys for Plaintiff Stanley Morrical 25 26 27 28

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	ВОТ	TINI & BOTTINI, INC.
2		By:	/s/ Francis A. Bottini, Jr.
3		Σ,	FRANCIS A. BOTTINI, JR.
4		7017	I1 A C C
5			Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102 lla, CA 92037
6		Tel:	(858) 914-2001
7		Fax:	(858) 914-2002 ni@bottinilaw.com
8		100111	in & bottimaw.com
9		Attor	neys for Plaintiff Andrea Bascheri and Jim Chung
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
ES			
TRE	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSEI	O] ORDER	. 12

⊛ LAW OFFICES COTCHETT, PITE & McCarthy, LLP

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	FINKELSTEIN THOMPSON LLP
2		Dec. /s/Dec. M.D.
3		By: /s/ Rosemary M. Rivas ROSEMARY M. RIVAS
		ROSEMARY M. RIVAS
4		505 Montgomery Street, Suite 300
5		San Francisco, CA 94111
6		Tel: (415) 398-8700
		Fax: (415) 398-8704
7		rrivas@finkelsteinthompson.com
8		
9		CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER &
		SPRENGEL LLP
10		Bryan L. Clobes
11		1101 Market Street, Suite 2650 Philadelphia, PA 19107
12		Tel: (215) 864-2800
		Fax: (215) 864-2810
13		bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
14		·
15		Anthony F. Fata
1.0		30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 3200
16		Chicago, Illinois 60606
17		Tel: 312.782.4880
18		Fax: 312.782.4485
19		afata@caffertyclobes.com
19		Attorneys for Plaintiff Joseph Tola
20		Thomeys for I wanty, voseph Tota
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
s		

⊛

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	JOH	NSON & WEAVER, LLP	
2		By:	/s/ Brett M. Weaver	
3		<b>3</b> ·	BRETT M. WEAVER	
4		Dratt	M. Weaver	
5			Vest "A" Street, Suite 750	
6		San D	Diego, CA 92101	
7		Tel:	(619) 230-0063	
8		Fax: brettw	(619) 255-1856 v@johnsonandweaver.com	
9				
10		Attori	neys for Plaintiff Martin Bertisch	
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
ES				
ES TRE	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] (	ORDER		14

⊛ LAW OFFICES COTCHETT, PITE & McCarthy, LLP

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	ROBBIN	NS ARROYO LLP
2		D	//GI
3		By:	/s/ Shane P. Sanders HANE P. SANDERS
		D.	IIIANE I. SANDENS
4		Brian J. I	Robbins
5		Felipe J.	Arroyo
6		Shane P.	Sanders
7		Kevin S.	
,		600 B St	
8		•	o, CA 92101
9			519) 525-3990 510) 525-3991
10			619) 525-3991 @robbinsarroyo.com
10		farroyo@	robbinsarroyo.com
11			@ robbinsarroyo.com obbinsarroyo.com
12		KKIII @ I	obbinsarioyo.com
13		Attorney	s for Plaintiff Philip Riccardi, Ernesto Espinoza,
		and the <b>C</b>	City of Birmingham Retirement and Relief System
14			
15			A WHITE P.A.
16		•	. White, III
		Lester R.	
17			rth Federal Highway, Suite 257 con, FL 33431
18			561) 394-3399
19		`	561) 394-3382
20		jwhite@s	saxenawhite.com
20			saxenawhite.com
21			
22			s for Plaintiff City of Birmingham Retirement and
23		Relief Sy	stem
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
ES			
LBE	STIDIII ATION AND IDDODOSE	DIODDED	15

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
2		By: /s/ Joseph E. Floren
3		JOSEPH E. FLOREN
4		JOSEPH E. FLOREN, State Bar No. 168292
5		CHRISTOPHER J. BANKS, State Bar No. 218779
6		KIM ALEXANDER KANE, State Bar No. 226896 MATTHEW S. WEILER, State Bar No. 236052
7		One Market Street, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126
8		Tel: 415.442.1000 / Fax: 415.442.1001
9		jfloren@morganlewis.com cbanks@morganlewis.com
10		kkane@morganlewis.com mweiler@morganlewis.com
11		
12		MARC J. SONNENFELD (adm. pro hac vice) KAREN PIESLAK POHLMANN (adm. pro hac vice)
13		1701 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921
14		Tel: 215.963.5000 / Fax: 215.963.5001
15		msonnenfeld@morganlewis.com kpohlmann@morganlewis.com
16		
17		Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
ES Tre	STIDLIL ATION AND IDDODOSEDLO	ADNED 16

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
2		By: /s/ Timothy A. Miller
3		TIMOTHY A. MILLER
4		
5		Allen J. Ruby Timothy A. Miller
6		Richard S. Horvath, Jr.
		525 University Avenue, Suite 1400
7		Palo Alto, CA 94301
8		Tel: (650) 470-4519
9		Fax: (650) 798-6602 Allen.Ruby@skadden.com
10		Timothy.Miller@skadden.com
11		Richard.Horvath@skadden.com
		Attomore for Defendants Mane I. Andreessen I surrence
12		Attorneys for Defendants Marc L. Andreessen, Lawrence T. Babbio, Jr., Sari M. Baldauf, Shumeet Banerji, Rajiv L.
13		Gupta, John H. Hammergren, Raymond J. Lane, Ann M.
14		Livermore, Gary M. Reiner Patricia F. Russo, Dominique
15		Senequier, G. Kennedy Thompson, and Ralph V.
16		Whitworth
17	DATED: February 14, 2013	WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, P.C.
18		BY: /s/ Steven M. Schatz
19		STEVEN M. SCHATZ
20		Katherine L. Henderson
21		Bryan J. Kertroser Brian Danitz
		650 Page Mill Road
22		Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
23		Tel: (650) 493-9300 Fax: (650) 565-5100
24		sschatz@wsgr.com
25		khenderson@wsgr.com bketroser@wsgr.com
26		bdanitz@wsgr.com
27		Attorneys for Defendant Catherine A. Lesjak
28		
ES		
TRE	STIPLII ATION AND IPPOPOSE	DI ADDED 17

1	DATED: January 14, 2013	FENWICK & WEST LLP	
2		BY:/s/ Kevin P. Muck	
3		KEVIN P. MUCK	
4		Marie C. Bafus	
5		Tahir I. Golden 555 California Street, 12th Floor	
6		San Francisco, CA 94104 Tel: (415) 875-2300	
7		Fax: (415) 281-1350	
8		kmuck@fenwick.com mbafus@fenwick.com	
9		tgolden@fenwick.com	
10		Attorneys for Defendant James T. Murrin	
11	DATED: February 14, 2013	COOLEY LLP	
12		BY: /s/ John C. Dwyer	
13		JOHN C. DWYER	
14		STEPHEN C. NEAL (SBN 170085) JOHN C. DWYER (SBN 136533)	
15		JEFFREY M. KABAN (SBN 235743) JEFFREY M. WALKER (SBN 280505)	
16		Five Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real	
17		Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155 Tel: (650) 843-5000	
18		Fax: (650) 849-7400 nealsc@cooley.com	
19		dwyerjc@cooley.com jkaban@cooley.com	
20		jwalker@cooley.com	
21		Attorneys For Defendant Margaret C. Whitman	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
ES Tre	STIPLILATION AND IPROPOSEDLO	RDER	18

1	DATED: February 14, 2013	SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
2		BY: /s/ Patrick D. Robbins
3		PATRICK D. ROBBINS
4		Patrick D. Robbins
5		Audrey A. Barron Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 3800
6		San Francisco, CA 94111-5994
7		Tel: (415) 616-1100 Fax: (415) 616-1199
8		probbins@shearman.com audrey.barron@shearman.com
9		
10		Alan Goudiss Sara Ricciardi
11		599 Lexington Avenue
12		New York, NY 10022-6069 Tel: (212) 848-4000
13		Fax: (212) 848-7179
		agoudiss@shearman.com sara.ricciardi@shearman.com
14		Attornous for Defendant Pevalla Weinhera Partners I.P.
15		Attorneys for Defendant Perella Weinberg Partners LP and Perella Weinberg Partners UK LLP
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
ES		

1 DATED: February 14, 2013 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP 2 BY: /s/ Steven M. Farina STEVEN M. FARINA 3 Steven M. Farina 4 Sarah Lynn Lochner 5 725 12th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 6 (202) 434-5000 7 (202) 434-5029 Fax: sfarina@wc.com 8 slochner@wc.com 9 Attorneys for Defendant KPMG LLP 10 11 I, Joseph E. Floren, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this Stipulation And [Proposed] Order. In compliance with Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that 12 each of the signatories identified above has concurred in this filing. 13 Executed this 14th day of February 2013 at San Francisco, California. 14 15 /s/ Joseph E. Floren JOSEPH E. FLOREN 16 17 18 19 ORDER 20 Based on the foregoing stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing, 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 DATED: February 19, 2013 IT IS SO ORDERED REYER 24 RICT COURT 25 Judge Charles R. Breyer 26 27 DB1/73146223.1 28 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER 20